CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 6. SEPTEMBER, 1916. Vol. VI.

IN MEMORIAM.

Second-Lieut. R. H. Ingoldby.

(Communicated).

Roger Ingoldby was the son of Mr. F. J. Ingoldby, of Westgate House, Louth, Lincolnshire. As a boy he trained on the *Conway*, meaning to be a sailor. He heard, however, what he felt to be the higher call to the Christian Ministry; took his degree at Emmanuel, Cambridge; studied for a year at Ripon Clergy College; and was Ordained by the Bishop of London in Advent, 1909, to the Junior Curacy of St. Thomas's, Camden Town, N.W., of which the Rev. Hubert Handley, with whom he formed a deep and lasting friendship, was Vicar.

An out-and-out Broad Churchman, his work in this large, poor London parish was of a rare nobility. From the first he took to his heart the outcasts of society, and became their special pastor and friend. Night after night, till the early morning hours, alone, bare-headed, clad in a cassock, he walked the dark streets of the parish helping drunken people, and endeavouring, not infrequently at personal risk, to rescue the most unfortunate women. Again and again he brought some miserable, sinking fellow-creature back to hope and self-respect and a better course, and he awoke among them an ardent gratitude and affection for himself. His favourite message to

them was, "God loves you," and he used to shew them the Crucifix, in whose healing power he had strong belief. Not always wise, sometimes wilful, deceived sometimes by adventurers, he persevered in romantic self-sacrifice for the erring and the wretched. His health broke down, and, after a short ministry in North Somercotes, Lincolnshire (at the memorial service held for him there, the largest number of communicants in the history of that Church assembled), in 1912 he joined the Archbishops' Mission to Canada, and was stationed in the Edmonton district. On the outbreak of the War he enlisted as a ranker in the Canadian Alberta Dragoons. He soon was promoted at the front in France to be Sec.-Lieut. in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers. He wrote home that "the army is glorious, and full of glorious opportunity amongst men." He often helped the chaplain at early services, and also took services himself; he loved his men, and was loved by them; and at last, aged 30, was killed amongst the heroes at the beginning of the great battle on July 2nd.

A fellow-officer who knew him well writes home:—

> "His Company (A) was the first to go over. . . . . The men of his Platoon told me afterwards that he went forward in advance with a smile on his face and a bomb in each hand, cheering them on. He never had any need to tell them to follow him, for he always inspired such confidence that there was not a man in the Company who would not follow him over to the German trenches at any time. I don't think there ever was an officer who could show more contempt for danger and disregard of his own comfort than Roger did. . . . . The men of his Platoon began by admiring him for his courage, then loved him for the interest he took in their comfort and the disregard he had for his own, till finally there was not a man amongst them who wouldn't gladly face death with 'Mr. Ingoldby, there.' The fact that he showed people that a man could live a decent, clean life and at the same time be the bravest and most self-sacrificing officer is, and always will be, an inspiration. I personally cannot imagine a better sermon."

Ah! Roger: those who knew you well will never forget you—your generous look, your gallant deeds, the great marks of character that were hidden away within you. Faithful unto death, profound is our confidence that the Crown of Life is yours.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

By The Editor.

The permission given by the Bishops of London and Chelmsford to certain approved women to speak in churches to congregations of women, on behalf of the National Mission has called forth a protest of so violent a character on the part of the extreme Anglican traditionalists that both bishops have withdrawn their permission. That the Bishop of London should have felt compelled to yield to the demands of his Janissaries is natural enough, but it has occasioned pained surprise among Evangelicals that the Bishop of Chelmsford should have also yielded in the supposed interests of peace. The bishops' proposal to make use of the services of these women was, we believe, on right lines, and it is a matter for regret that having decided to do it within very carefully prescribed limits, threats and denunciations should have made them go back on that decision.

The arguments used against the public ministry of women in the Church seem to be based mainly upon the Roman Canon Law and on certain statements of St. Paul. The Roman Canon Law has no more authority for modern Churchmen than the Roman Papacy, and although some of our Anglo-Catholic brethren may persuade themselves that the Canon Law is binding on themselves, they will find ere long that that position will compel them ultimately to yield to the authority of the Pope and to discard that of the English Church.

As for the regulations formulated by St. Paul for the guidance of his Corinthian converts, these regulations must be viewed, not as enactments to be observed everywhere and for all time, but rather as injunctions issued to deal with certain contemporary and local conditions.

Principles are permanent, but the regulations which enforce them change of necessity with changing circumstances. Moreover, the Pauline injunctions are of doubtful interpretation, it being quite possible to argue that St. Paul prohibited not

widows or virgins, but only married women from preaching in the Christian assembly. However, what St. Paul prohibited in this matter in Corinth some nineteen hundred years ago is no more binding on Christians in England to-day than are the directions which our Lord issued to the seventy disciples binding on our modern Christian missionaries. St. Paul, in this matter of the ministry of women, had to harmonize two great principles, and our fathers in God have to harmonize the same principles to-day.

The first principle is *the spiritual equality of men and women.* The Christian religion in contrast to Mohammedanism, Hinduism, and many other religions, regards men and women as spiritually equal. The early Christian missionary went out into the great Roman Empire proclaiming the Gospel of Christ as the divine agency for the unification of mankind. The early Christian Church recognised no national distinctions, no social distinctions, no sexual distinctions. "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus,"* was the Pauline proclamation. All men and women were equally children of the One Great Father, all were equally dear to the One Supreme Saviour, all were equally recipients of the One Holy Spirit, and the Christian Church received them all without distinction and difference.

The second principle is that of *Church Order and Efficiency.* One Spirit operates in all Christians, but His operations are manifold and His gifts are diverse. These gifts are not primarily for private use, but for the benefit of the whole Body of Christ, hence regulation and order are needful in their exercise that thereby a profitable co-operation may be achieved.

And so Christian women, possessors with Christian men of the gifts of the Spirit, had their ministerial functions in the Early Church; some were prophetesses, like the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist, and the Christian assemblies no doubt benefited by their preaching. When, however, the whole

* Gal. iii. 28.

prophetic order became discredited in the early third century, prophesying women passed over into Montanism and ceased to be a regular feature of Catholicism. There have, of course, been women prophets in the Christian Church in subsequent ages, but there has been no female prophetic ministry since the very early days. Women, however, were also permitted to serve in the Christian ministry as deaconesses. Phoebe is the earliest known member of that order.[1] They performed for women very much the same functions which deacons performed for men, assisting at their baptism, instructing them, visiting the sick, presiding at their meetings, shewing them to their places in church. These deaconesses were solemnly ordained, and were either widows or virgins. Their relation to the order of widows is dubious; some have identified the latter with them, others have regarded the order of widows as inferior.

With the rise of the monastic movement, women formed their own conventual bodies presided over by one of their own sex, and carried out those works of devotion, and charity, and education which were also characteristic of their monastic brothers. They did not, however, minister the sacraments in the congregation—although like all women they might baptize privately in cases of extreme urgency—nor did they preach.

The Church of Christ to-day is not, however, tied down by the precedents of the past. The two great Christian principles which were the guiding stars of the ecclesiastical organizer in St. Paul's day must be those of our bishops. There is nothing in the essential nature of women or of the Christian religion which excludes women from the prophetic and priestly offices. St. Peter and the early Church believed that the prophecy of Joel was fulfilled in the Christian dispensation: "And it shall come to pass afterwards, saith the Lord, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,"[2] and we see no reason to disagree with that view.

As for the Christian ministerial priesthood, it is as Bishop Lightfoot points out, *representative* of the whole body of priests

[1] Rom. xvi. 1. [2] Joel ii. 28. *cf.* Acts ii. 17.

which compose the Christian Church. If therefore women are to be appointed to representative offices in the Christian Church to discharge ministerial functions for the whole sacerdotal body, there must of necessity be a strongly and clearly expressed desire on the part of the Church that women should represent them in these offices.

For various reasons—some of them due to to the ecclesiastical traditions of the past, some of them due to the lingering yet unchristian feeling that woman is spiritually inferior to man, some of them due to the limited and very inadequate character of female education until quite recent times—there has been no strongly expressed desire in the Church that women should serve in the representative ministerial offices. However, with the changes that are coming about in these matters, there is little doubt that the demand will come for women to act as Christian ministers. It will come, not as the result of organized feminist agitation, but quite naturally, and with increasing pressure as women become more and more of a power in the fields of education and of social and industrial organization. When the demand really comes, we hope our Church authorities will regard it as a very proper demand, and one which may be turned to good account, and that they will take steps to comply with it in the spirit of St. Paul's great axiom:

> "All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient."
> "All things are lawful for me, but all things edify not."

We hope that they will acknowledge at once the rightness of the demand, and merely concentrate their attention on the best ways and means of realizing it. Those means may be various, and they may be novel. Not a mixed ministry of men and women ministering to mixed congregations, but special orders of ministerial women ministering to women congregations may be the best practical solution of the problem. But it must never be forgotten that the problem is one not of right and wrong, but of practical utility, and being approached in that spirit it is capable of an experimental and satisfactory solution.

In the early days Priscilla was the tutor in the Christian Faith of the mighty Apollos, and we may well regard her as the forerunner of the Christian woman educationist of the future. Highly trained Christian women, at no very distant date, will have their unique functions in the Christian Church, and, if needs be, receive special orders to help them to discharge them. St. Paul, although some have called him a misogynist, does not forget to mention with gratitude Euodia and Syntyche, his women fellow-labourers, "whose names are in the book of life," and our Christian apostles of the future will not have less cause to be grateful to their women fellow-labourers. Our Primate with wise forethought by his efforts to encourage and promote the higher religious education of women on modern lines is taking the right course to prepare them for ministerial functions in the future. The episcopate is not likely to refuse them solemn ordination, but were it to do so, it may be well for them to remember that there is another ordination of which the episcopal ordination is but the outward and visible sign.

It was a woman missionary who wrote:—

"Christ the Lord of Life hath sent me
Through the midnight lands,
Mine the mighty ordination
Of the Pierced Hands."

PRO CHRISTO ET PATRIA.

The two Loyalties implied in my title—that to one's Country, as shown in a readiness "to bear weapons and serve in the wars," and that to the Founder of Christianity—are not by all men regarded as compatible. There are those among us who uphold war, regardless, if not contemptuous, of its apparent prohibition by Christ; there are others who denounce war—all war—as incompatible with His teaching. And there are again others, especially among such as can accept the Thirty-Nine Articles as an adequate exposition of religious duty, who adopt

a middle course and, to the best of their ability, adhere to each of the Loyalties in question.

But there are some of us who, though unconvinced by the *ipse dixit* of the Thirty-Seventh Article, are yet unable to occupy either of the more extreme positions indicated above. They cannot sacrifice either of their Loyalties. Their heart goes out to the heroic stand for freedom and justice now being made by their country and her allies; they are moved to the depths by the suffering of prisoners and wounded: they would feel themselves shamed past recovery did they not do what in them lay to aid the one and relieve the other. But—they are Christians. By upbringing, by conviction, by the long sweet habit—it may be—of a life-time, they have learnt to accept the New Testament as their rule of life, and the Sermon on the Mount as its central teaching. Is it possible that this teaching condemns the instincts of the patriot?

The texts mainly relied upon by the opponents of war are St. Matt. v. 39, 40: "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also." These precepts the advocates of war have tried in various ways to limit or modify, not always very convincingly. Thus we are told on the one hand that they have a temporary application only, being concerned with the correct attitude of a disciple of Christ to his heathen conqueror; on the other hand, that they apply only to private and personal—not international—relations. Both interpretations cannot be true, and each of them would seem to give too narrow an account of rules framed for a Society not, in its Founder's intention, either local or transitory, but world-wide and enduring. Again, an attempt is sometimes made to neutralise the injunctions in question by opposing to them other passages, which seem to contradict them. Thus we are reminded of the words--"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. x. 34), or of the command—"He that hath no sword,

let him sell his garment and buy one" (Luke xxii. 36). But it seems clear from a reference to the context that the first passage refers simply to the persecution foreseen by the Master as entailed by loyalty to Himself; and that the command to the disciples, satisfied as it was by the production of two swords only, can scarcely have served any purpose but to demonstrate the futility and inexpediency of armed resistance.

But there are more satisfying arguments than these. In the first place, it is indisputable that much of the Sermon on the Mount cannot be taken literally. No one, as a matter of fact, does so take it. No one, even among the Friends, who refuse the oath, and condemn war, literally offers his cheek to the smiter,[1] or allows a litigant, if he can help it, to deprive him of his raiment. All schools are agreed that such expressions are metaphorical, intended only to emphasise, in Oriental phrase, the principle they embody.

"But," it may be urged, the words 'resist not evil,' prefacing the specific injunction to turn theother cheek, are surely not metaphorical! They lay down a principle, of which the words following are a concrete illustration."

To this it may be answered that the Greek word translated "evil," is used both for an injury and an injurious person, and that if we adopt the corrected reading of the Revised Version, "him that is evil," the result is a single injunction, given as so often in Scripture—first on its negative, then on its positive side. It is as though the words had run—"Strive not with an assailant, but if he smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other." So read, the two parts of our text stand on the same footing, and the argument against a literal rendering applies to both.[2]

How then should they be rendered? The answer is suggested by another saying of the Master's—"The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (John

[1] The turning the cheek to the smiter appears to have been an accepted symbol of meekness. See Is. l. 6 and Lam. iii. 30.

[2] It may be worth noticing that the words "Resist not evil" do not occur in St. Luke's report of the Sermon.

vi. 68); and we find the suggestion enforced by His own example. It is a significant fact, in connection with our subject, that the teaching of the New Covenant was based on that of the Old. "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17). Now the God of the Old Testament was, in a very real sense, a God of Battles. It was by fighting that Israel won and maintained his inheritance, and no literature surpasses his own in the splendour and frequency of its pictures of victory and of vengeance. Indeed, it is because of the war-like character of the Old Testament that some of our pacifists have repudiated it, and accused their opponents of advocating an obsolete morality, contradicting that of Christ.

But Christ Himself was conscious of no such contradiction. Through the darkness of internecine struggle, of enactments permitted, if not decreed, "for the hardness of men's hearts," He saw the dawning promise of a perfect day. He saw, too, that the light, though fitfully and partially discerned, and only by the best of His nation, had yet grown steadily brighter. From kindness and compassion to members of His own race, from tenderness to the stranger and the proselyte, from appreciation of the virtues of an alien ruler or nation, the Jew—in the person of Isaiah—had risen to the conception of a world-wide community so like the Kingdom preached by Christ, that commentators have seen in it a direct prophecy of the Christian Church.

> "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

The likeness is, in fact, identity. The ideal of Isaiah was the ideal of Christ. He spoke as a Jew to Jews, and showed that the essence and aim of His teaching were those of the Law under which they lived. Love to God and man was, He told them, the real meaning of the Decalogue, and His famous interpretation of the Fourth Commandment showed how, in the light of that meaning, its separate provisions should be dealt with.

Can there be any reasonable doubt that His own precepts should be treated in like fashion? They are, in fact, but the reiteration and expansion of the old. They are still symbols only of the love they illustrate and emphasise. As we study them, we realise that obedience to the letter may in many cases be an actual violation of the spirit they embody. The Law of Love by which we are bound, demands charity to kinsman, friend, and enemy, not only individually but collectively. By undue subservience to any one of these we may injure not the one only but the many. And if we extend the scope of the relation, giving it a political signification; if by kinsmen we understand our fellow-countrymen, by friends an allied nation, by enemies a hostile power, the same reasoning holds. We have in all cases to consider the general good, assured that in so doing we subserve the real need of each—whether it be that of loyal service, or of friendly co-operation, or—it may be—of defeat and overthrow.

It would seem then that a just war, so far from being opposed to Christianity, may be actually demanded by it. But the same Christianity—that is, the Law of Love which is its essence—will of course condemn an unjust war, one actuated by the lust of conquest or of vengeance. It forbids all cruelty, and abjures the gospel of hate. It prescribes a chivalrous respect for the prisoner and non-combatant, and more especially for the woman and the child. And above all, it bids us remember that it is only the world's backwardness in love that can ever make war a necessity; and that the ideal of Christ, the reign of universal peace and goodwill, must be our own ideal and constant aim if we would be true to Him.

So thinking and so acting, the Christian patriot need have no fear of disloyalty to His Master. In the continual calls made upon him for endurance, magnanimity, and self-sacrifice, he has opportunities, unknown in quieter days, for the exercise of Christian virtue. His service, whether at home or in the battlefield, is the service of Christ, and the banner he follows the banner of the Cross.

MARY A. WOODS.

RELIGIOUS AND ECCLESIASTICAL IDEALS.

By the Rev. Canon Papillon, M.A., St. Albans.

I choose this double title, because the two terms in it are by no means synonymous. Much of what is most religious in human motives and in human life lies quite apart from ecclesiastical aims and practice; while in many ecclesiastical ideas, many ecclesiastical personages, and many ecclesiastical systems in all ages there has been, and is still, much that is not distinctively religious. This is true, I think, of the medieval conception of the Visible Church and its part in human affairs, as brought to a head under Pope Gregory VII., and it is also true of such great spiritual forces as that set in motion by Francis of Assisi. It is still true wherever Churchmen are worldly and self-seeking and covetous of money or of power; or where earnest souls think only how they may spend and be spent in their Master's service, caring little for dignity or worldly reward, regardless of the frowns or smiles of great men in Church or State. It has been true, too, of one and the same ideal or movement at different periods or stages; when, *e.g.*, an ideal at first religious has degenerated into something merely ecclesiastical, or even secular and worldly, as with the great Society of the Jesuits. Many of us can illustrate it on a smaller scale from personal experience: we all know what a gulf there can be, and sometimes is, between the ecclesiastical and the religious.

I. With regard to religious ideals that have influenced Christianity at large, their growth may be traced in varying conceptions of the "Kingdom of God"—the central ideal for which Christians are taught to pray that it may come on earth. There have been three main conceptions of this ideal:

(1) The perfect reign of God in heaven after the Last Judgment; (2) a visible reign of Christ on earth between His second coming and the Last Judgment, the "Millennium"; (3) The Visible Church on earth between the first and second coming of Christ. The first of these ideals, the perfect reign of God in heaven, has always been, and still is, in the background as supreme; but it has been partly overshadowed at different times by the others. "Millennarianism" or "Chiliasm" predominated for four centuries down to the time of Augustine, who at first himself held it. Afterwards, however, he changed his mind (he was great enough not to be ashamed of doing so); and in his famous work *De Civitate Dei*, he inaugurated that other ideal of the Visible Church as the Kingdom of God which has influenced all later Church history. From this ideal, combined with that of the Papacy as the successor of the Holy Roman Empire, grew the medieval conception of a Church directing both spiritual and temporal affairs upon a basis of Papal absolutism. This ideal was almost realized under Gregory VII., the Caesar, as he conceived himself, of a spiritual monarchy at Rome based on the theory of Augustine's *City of God*, which should rule the world by religion. It was a lofty spiritual ideal, but it soon became a very earthly reality. The ideal Pope proved to be as imaginary as an ideal King or an ideal Republic. Unbridled lust of temporal power, with unscrupulous use of worldly means to secure it, gradually discredited the spiritual claims of the Visible Church to be the Kingdom of God on earth. Its intellectual claims as the preserver of learning, of poetry, art and music, and as the author of benefits to human civilisation—claims which partly atoned for its ambition, rapacity and cruelty—have also been discredited by its refusal to recognise liberty of thought and of conscience. That great medieval ideal of the Visible Church as the Kingdom of God on earth, bearing priestly rule over the bodies and souls of men, has been shattered by the verdict of history. What is to take its place now? Where are *we* to look for an ideal of the Kingdom of God on earth?

Not, surely, to any form of ecclesiastical organization or "reunion" of religious bodies now divided; rather, perhaps, to a better and more spiritual understanding of the expression "Church Catholic" or "Universal." For whatever reunion may come about between existing Churches or sects, the Church of Rome stands outside with claims that are long a-dying, however pitiful an anachronism they appear under the search-light of history. A more inspiring ideal than reunion of Churches is the vision of a spiritual fellowship of all mankind, a Communion of Saints in the widest sense, leading on to a final moral and spiritual triumph of Christian principles in human life, social or individual, which may realize the Kingdom of God on earth. Some such ideal, indeed, seems to be already displacing the traditional form of the Advent hope, and the apocalyptic imagery of the Last Judgment. It finds voice in "Christian Socialism" and similar movements, which lays stress on active benevolence as a main ingredient in the religious life—sometimes in apparent forgetfulness that personal holiness and likeness to Christ is the highest ideal of all for the individual Christian. For the corporate life of Christians, as expressed in the Church, the ideal most suitable to the present age seems to be that of a Church free, comprehensive and tolerant, progressive and not stationary, endeavouring to adapt itself to the intellectual and moral needs of the time.

II. Such an ideal, however, is not only religious, but also ecclesiastical. Now ecclesiastical ideals (as intimated above) are not always, and sometimes only to a very limited extent, religious ideals. They start from a religious foundation; they claim to promote religion, but too often they express only what men think best for the external interests of the religious body to which they belong, in regard to such matters as Church authority and discipline, the power of the Church in temporal affairs, its control of education, its voice in social questions, the training and status of its priesthood, its rights to property, or the extent to which the laity may be granted a

share in Church government. On most of such questions ideals differ widely with differences of intellectual or spiritual temperament. That "voice of the Church," of which we sometimes hear, will never be one voice of uniform sound unless—which Heaven forbid!—one predominant party within the fold can absorb and silence all others; an ideal thus far realized by the Church of Rome, but at what frightful cost of intellectual freedom and independence! We of the Church of England are in no great danger now of falling under such a yoke as presses upon the Roman ecclesiastic who dares to think for himself. But something like it, one cannot help noting, finds a place among the ecclesiastical ideals of some of our clergy, from Bishops downwards; and while this is so, others must of necessity be in profound and radical disagreement with them. It is hard, I confess, even to understand, hard also to appreciate fairly the point of view taken on various current questions by leaders of the extreme "Anglo-Catholic" party; and they probably find equal difficulty in understanding or tolerating the point of view of a "Broad" Churchman like myself. We must agree to differ; only recognizing, as far as possible, each other's sincerity and honesty, so that all our differences may be with charity, and due respect for other people's ideals.

I must be content with briefly noticing certain current ideals which strike me as more ecclesiastical than religious—Utopias, one might call them, to which many eyes turn longingly, but (as I think) in vain.

1. The practice or belief of the Primitive Church, or of the Church Universal, or "The consent of Christian antiquity," to which appeal is often made by those who wish to get behind the obligations of the Reformation settlement, always seems (to me at any rate) a peculiarly nebulous Utopia, a misty island in a cloud-wrapt sea, where no pilot can take soundings and no harbour receive the venturous mariner. What is "Christian antiquity?" Within what limits of time? Where, by whom, and with what authority, has its "consent" been

formulated? Till some clearer answer to such questions, and to others that might be asked, is forthcoming, this voice of Christian antiquity is but a siren voice from a dangerous coast; it were best to stop our ears and hurry past.

2. The vision of ecclesiastical independence is another Utopian ideal—a will-o'-the-wisp that leads, or misleads, ardent souls who chafe against restrictions of the law which is our security, alike for civil and for religious liberty. This ideal takes varying forms with current disputes and controversies. One form, *e.g.*, is the desire for a purely ecclesiastical court of final appeal in ecclesiastical causes; a desire which surely forgets the plain teaching of history, that ecclesiastical rule with temporal power at its command has always tended to injustice and tyranny; a desire which also forgets the constitutional maxim that in this country the Sovereign is "over all causes, ecclesiastical as well as temporal, within his dominions, supreme," and that nothing can deprive any English citizen of his constitutional right to appeal to the courts which represent his Sovereign. "I appeal unto Caesar" is a charter of liberty against partisan intolerance to us, as it was to St. Paul.

3. Another ideal is the vision of a stricter ecclesiastical discipline. "Until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished." Thus, in one of her authorized formularies, does the Church of England profess to desire a return to the primitive discipline of public confession and penance at the beginning of Lent, with a view to absolution and restoration to full communion at Easter. The words sound strangely unreal upon the lips of English Churchmen to-day. They are an obvious anachronism, like the obsolete regulations still found in our Prayer-Book—*e.g.*, the disciplinary provisions of rubrics prefixed to the Communion Office. It is possible that some clergy really feel those words as they read the "Commination" upon Ash Wednesday; possible that with some a wish to restore the discipline of the confessional has been father to the thought that it can be restored, and to

attempts at enforcing it in defiance of the existing law of the Church of England. Such men, perhaps, honestly desire a discipline as efficient as that of the Church of Rome, forgetting that Rome would make short work of a similar attitude on the part of any of her priests to the rules of *their* Church.

It is of course one of the difficulties in the position of the Prayer-Book as part of an Act of Parliament, unalterable except with the consent of Parliament, that its rules and formularies still sanction disciplinary procedure which lapse of time has rendered obsolete. The existence of such enactments side by side with those that are still in practical force increases the difficulty of Church authorities in enforcing Church discipline. If the Rev. A. B. is episcopally reproved for teaching obligatory confession or the ceremonial use of incense, he asks why the Rev. C. D. should not equally be censured for omitting the *Quicunque Vult* (as so many do nowadays) or for not saying Morning and Evening Prayer daily in his church. "Why should sins of omission," he argues, "be more tenderly regarded than sins of commission?" to which, as a merely abstract question, there is no plain and obvious answer. Still greater becomes the difficulty where discipline is variously exercised in different dioceses according to the personal bias of different Bishops; for unless there is uniformity in discipline, there is apt to be chaos. There is, indeed, some ground for the reproach that there is little or no discipline in the Church of England, and for the ideal of a stricter Church rule. But if the alternative to existing laxity is to be a system at all resembling the rigid, unrelenting, unenlightened, unsympathetic discipline of the Vatican, most English Churchmen, surely, would

"rather bear the ills they have
Than fly to others that they know not of."

Many who *have* made that change, from Cardinal Newman downwards, have been sorely disillusioned. Ideals are sometimes fascinating; but reality is often safer.

4. There is, however, one other ideal to which eyes and minds are turning, and not in vain. It is at present the ideal

of a minority in the Church of England, but it has good omen and promise for the future—the ideal which inspires efforts to reconcile traditional Church doctrine with modern knowledge and modern thought, moulded by the scientific spirit; or, to put it in another way, to restate old formulae in terms of modern thought. During the intellectual awakening of the past 50—60 years, this ideal has from time to time found a voice that compelled attention—*e.g.*, in *Essays and Reviews* (published 1860), a generation later in *Lux Mundi*, and again for our generation in such books as Mr. J. M. Thompson's *Miracles in the New Testament*, or the volume of essays by young Oxford divines, entitled *Foundations*. This form of religious ideal is always, or nearly always, frowned upon by Church authority; and just now it runs strongly counter to so predominant a force in English Churchmanship as the "Anglo-Catholic" or "Tractarian" spirit, powerfully organized in the "English Church Union," and ably voiced by the *Church Times*. But, in spite of official discouragement and the dislike and suspicion of multitudes who never really think out their religious belief, this ideal is inspiring many of the ablest and most liberal-minded English Churchmen, old and young; and it heralds a promise of new life for the Church and for religion. Personally, I believe in the future of "Broad" or "Modernist" Churchmanship for this reason among others, that its eyes are turned towards the light and the sun-rising. For surely the only ideals, secular or religious, that will in the end prevail, are those which look forward, and not backward, for their Golden Age.

A MEDIAEVAL ANTI-SCHOLASTIC.

By Rev. J. C. Hardwick, B.A.

> "I offer this book to the sight—not of philosophers and wise men of the world, nor of great theologians wrapped in endless questionings; but of the simple and untaught, those who seek to love God rather than to know many things. For not by disputing, but by doing will He be known, and by loving."

These are bold expressions to insert in the preface to a book in the fourteenth century, especially a book written in Latin, a tongue more familiar to "philosophers and wise men of the world," than to the "simple and untaught."

Naive as they may be, the words occur in the prologue to the *Incendium Amoris,* the work of an author perhaps less known to-day than he deserves—Richard Rolle, of Hampole, in Yorkshire, who lived the life of a hermit in the earlier half of the fourteenth century.

Not very much is known of Rolle's early life, except that he went to Oxford about 1316, and left that university three years later, wearied or disgusted with scholasticism, to live as a religious solitary in his native county.

The *Incendium Amoris* is a kind of *Apologia*, in part autobiographical, for the hermit life.

Scholasticism, after all, is congenial only to certain types of mind. A taste for mechanical ideas, and a certain pedantry of method, which is sometimes less barren than it seems, are the chief qualifications. Everyone is not capable of them, and the history of theology is a record of the successive revolts of those who have been thus incapable.

The pietist and the intellectualist will never perhaps take the same view of religion; the quarrel between them is a perpetual one, because the values they place upon things are fundamentally diverse.

Richard Rolle is a typical enough example of the anti-scholastic. He would appear to have had little or no sympathy for mechanical minds. Theological and institutional formalism alike, whether among the schoolmen of Oxford, or the ecclesiastics of Yorkshire, wearied him. "The old woman oftentimes knows more of the love of God than the theologians," is his verdict.

We must not suppose, however, that there was anything of the Lollard about Rolle. He was a faithful enough son of the Church, though not uncritical of some of her methods. The orthodox theology (though not its scholastic refinements) had provided the atmosphere in which his piety had grown. If he criticised the theologians or ecclesiastics, he did so, not as the exponent of a new theology or of a reformed ecclesiasticism, but from the point of view of the pietist. The difference between mystic and formalist is one of temperament, and not of creed.

Rolle's piety is true and genuine. The *Incendium Amoris* abounds in passages of a truly lyrical fervour. But through them all breathes the stern, moral earnestness of the prophet and the seer.

In these days of *dilettante* mysticality, it is perhaps well to insist on the moral basis of Rolle's religious experience. Only after the exercise of a strenuous discipline does the devout soul win its way to the ecstasies of divine love.

> "First, indeed, must a man exercise himself assiduously for not a few years in prayer and meditation, hardly snatching the necessities of bodily life." (ch. 32).

"Every appetite for worldly vanity," must be thrust away. Nor will Rolle hear of a love of God that does not involve love of one's neighbour.

> "Herein do men err from God's love, and know not how to attain to it, because they study not how they may love their neighbour." (ch. 25).

Indeed Rolle displays something of a Hebrew zeal for social righteousness.

"They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave," he says of "the great and rich men of the

world, who burn ever with hungry desire to acquire other men's possessions." (ch. 30).

This ascetic piety, however, did not lead to or spring from any sort of self-satisfaction:—

> "If anyone live an holy and a just life, let him not on that account despise sinners, for it is because they have not grace to resist that they fall before temptation. None can work well and love God and be self-controlled, except God grant him the power."

"What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" he asks elsewhere. As Pascal said:—

> "To make a man a saint, grace is very necessary, and whoso doubts it knows neither what a saint is, nor what is a man."

The mystic, owing to the fact that he makes small account of the current learning of the day, but concerns himself with experiences that change little with the ages, must often seem peculiarly modern. The truth is, not that he is modern, but that he belongs to every age. Nothing could have a more modern ring than the following passage; though in fact, it is no more modern than Job's questionings:—

> "He perfectly knows God who realises that He is incomprehensible and beyond full knowledge."[1]

It is the scholastic, like Newman, who speaks of a *science* of God. "Lord, thou knowest our foolishness" is the cry of the humility which is religious.

It is interesting to note that the piety of which the *Incendium Amoris* speaks, is allied to an unexpected sanity of outlook.

To quote the latest commentator upon that work:—

> "Although Rolle's estimate of the worthiness of the solitary life is more mediaeval than modern, his estimate of the asceticism which should accompany it is more modern than mediaeval. His advice accords much more closely with the dicta of modern psychologists than with that usually given by mediaeval religious to those whom they were instructing."[2]

Rolle believed in the habit of the cheerful face, the active mind, the busy hand. *Acedia* or inert pessimism (a recognised sin in mediaeval times) must at all costs be avoided.

---

[1] *Incomprehensibilem et incognoscibilem.* (Cap. 6).

[2] Miss Margaret Deanesly's edition of the *Incendium*, published by the Manchester University Press, 1915.

> "And if ever that gentle ease in prayer or meditation fail thee . . . and thou canst not sing as thou wert wont; cease not thou to read or pray, or to do something useful either outside or within thyself, lest thou decline into laziness or languour (*otiositatem vel accidiam*). (Ch. 11).

Discipline, though strict, must be wisely used. A man cannot praise God if he lacks all energy to sing.

> "It would be better in ignorance to exceed the mean in a small thing, while one doeth it to support nature, than begin to flag with overmuch fasting, and through bodily weakness have not strength enough to sing." (Ch. 11).

And elsewhere he speaks of the cheerfulness (*hilaritas*) which characterises one who is devoted to God, and which is a mean between excessive high and low spirits. He will have nothing to say to those who condemn laughter; the laughter which springs "from gladness of conscience and from spiritual joy," is "praiseworthy and only found among the just." (Ch. 9).

The *Incendium Amoris,* though the Latin is sometimes tedious, abounds in passages of rare beauty and a deep insight; and its title is not ill-chosen, for its pages glow with the fervour of a genuine enthusiasm. Rolle's ecstacies remind us that one of the fruits of the Spirit is, or should be, joy.

The following passage in English[1] might seem to lack virility; so gravely have our pseudo-pietists depreciated the language of religious emotion, but in Latin it rings true:—

> "*O mellifluus ardor omnibus deliciis dulcior, cunctis operibus delectabilior! O Deus meus, O amor meus; illabere mihi, tua caritate perforato, tua pulchritudine vulnerato; illabere, inquam, et languentem consolare medicina tua; misero ostende te amanti.*" (Ch. 2).

He who turns to God has indeed simplified life:—

> "I grieve not, save for sin; I love not, save that I love Him; I hope not, except in Him; naught saddens me but my guilt; naught gladdens me but Christ." (Ch. 12).

In reading the book some further notable passages stand out. We give them in English, but the terser Latin is the better vehicle:—

[1] Nevertheless we venture to translate:—"O sweet ardour, sweeter than all delights, more charming than all activities! Oh my God, my love, fill me, pierced by thy love, wounded by thy beauty, fill me, I say; and, when I languish, console me with thy medicine; show thyself to thy lover in his wretchedness."

"Not by disputation, but by acting and loving will God be known." (Prologue).

"He who loves much is great, he who loves less is less: for we are valued in God's eyes according to the love that is in us." (Ch. 7).

"O Lord, expand my heart, that it become wide enough to comprehend thy love." [1]

And (an echo of St. Augustine):—

"The soul of man, fitted for God alone, cannot be filled with anything less than God." (Ch. 11).

"It is he with whom God is not that is alone." (Ch. 13).

"If thou seekest to be loved—love." (Ch. 25).

"There is naught more wretched than to have been happy." (Ch. 39).

"Love is a light burden, which weighs not upon him who bears it, but eases him." (Ch. 41).

The twentieth century can perhaps find more spiritual pabulum in the pages of Rolle than in the disputes and refinements of his more learned contemporaries.

Theologians indeed have their uses, and every age owes a debt to its own scribes. But religious experience is of every age, and Rolle writes in a tongue which all can understand, or reminds us of truths that belong to no particular epoch.

We do well to put the question from time to time, "From heaven or of men?" Religion is eternal, but the theologism of each age bears in itself the seeds of its own decay. Rolle is alive, though the pages of his scholastical contemporaries speak to us of a dead world and of an intellectual environment long since passed away.

[1] "*O Domine, dilata cor meum, ut capacius fiat ad percipiendum amorem tuum.*" (Ch. 9).

THE PRAYER BOOK TO-DAY.

By the Ven. T. Herbert Bindley, D.D.

To those who are familiar with the four previous revisions of the English Prayer Book, carried out, as many would say to-day, at apparently the most inopportune times, the idea of further revisions both in the immediate and in the distant future cannot be repugnant. No literary work, however well adapted for its own age, can express adequately the instincts and outlook of a succeeding age. This is peculiarly the case with the expression of religious feeling; for the Spirit of God is ever teaching and enlarging the religious consciousness; and each age ought reverently to adapt its methods of worship to the needs and powers of expression of its own time. Language alters in meaning, the outlook upon the universe widens, the conception of true religion expands, the ideas of the nature and character of God become clearer, purer, and higher; and therefore modes of worship, and the expression of worship, need fresh forms in which to clothe themselves and become intelligible and useful for the altered conditions of thought and mind.

Bishop Westcott remarked (*Revelation of the Father*, pref. vii. 1884) that "no formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation which follows." I should prefer to say myself that no formula which is employed to express the belief of one generation can be used to express adequately the quickened and developed apprehension of the same belief in succeeding generations. The facts are not altered, but the modes in which they are apprehended are different. Each age is bound by the development of its spiritual consciousness and insight to scrutinize, reform, or re-adapt the work of its predecessors; for Revelation is continuous, marching side by side with the advance of knowledge. This does not in the least impugn the deposit of the faith once for all delivered to the saints; it only modifies our views about the modes in which that faith ought to be apprehended. The consensus of Christian belief has, as

a matter of fact, often had to shift and remodel its ideas about the modes in which facts have been presented for its acceptance. The truths remain the same in their spiritual reality, and for the most part the remodelling of the ideas has come about unconsciously. It is well that the Church, never anxious to define, though sometimes driven to it—and generally with disaster—has distinctly refused to define in certain cases. What we need is the repeated efforts of every generation of believers to understand, readapt, and restate.

A very simple illustration of this can be found within the content of the Apostles' Creed, from which we can see how naturally, and without any violence done to our spiritual belief, we have yet shifted from the literal acceptance of what we affirm. When the earth was believed to be flat, and the centre of the Universe, and the sun to be revolving round it, it was natural to express the idea of heaven as something above and the abode of the departed as something beneath. Hence the clauses in the Apostles' Creed that Christ "descended into hades and ascended into heaven,"—as though motions described in terms of locality were applicable to spiritual truths. But when the earth was perceived to be round and to constitute but a speck in the great Universe, a satellite of a small sun amid a myriad of suns greater than ours, then the terms of descent or ascent were at once felt to be out of place. But the spiritual truths remained the same, though the mode of expressing them became out of date. Yet we have passed without shock or upsetting of our faith from the erroneous earlier conception to the truer later one. Spiritual truth can only be expressed in terms of the knowledge of the time. We cannot anticipate future discoveries or growth of knowledge; but neither can we express our worship of to-day fully and adequately in terms of yesterday.

We have also to remember that the question of Prayer Book revision is not a question of choice with us now. We are in the midst of it. Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations by King Edward VII. nine years ago, and have

been re-issued by the present sovereign, just as they were issued by King Charles II. in October, 1661, ordering some revision to be taken in hand. True, we are much longer about it; because, instead of a small committee of Convocation, with expert liturgiologists as assistants being appointed to deal with it, the whole Convocations, sitting separately, waste time, and debate every single verbal alteration suggested by individual whim and caprice. Still we may be thankful that something is being done or attempted to be done.

What I want to do in this paper is to point out the lines upon which a true revision ought to proceed. And I do not think any better models could be before us than those of Cranmer in his Preface of 1549 and of Sanderson in his Preface of 1662. Cranmer laid down four heads of procedure—purification, simplification, intelligibility, uniformity; while Sanderson said that the 1661 revisers aimed at simplification, intelligibility, the best translation of Scripture, and the provision of new Offices and Prayers.

The general feeling, nowadays, is rather against uniformity and in favour of greater elasticity in the conduct of Divine Worship. Our habits of life, and the hours we keep, have all altered during the last hundred years, and our services ought to conform, so far as may be, to our altered customs, which, again, themselves differ very much in town and country.

As a matter of fact we find that the last Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline recommended to His Majesty that

> "Letters of Business be issued to the Convocations with instructions to frame such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches as may tend to secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand. . . . . In regard to the sanction to be given for the use of additional and special services, collects, and hymns, the law should be so amended as to give wide scope for the exercise of a regulative authority."

Those recommendations came from a very high authority, and from men of very varying views, but they cover, I think, all that we need for a proper revision of the Prayer Book.

We must have reverence for the past, and be careful not to break the line of continuity which our reformers were so anxious to guard. And our task is far easier than theirs; for our object would rather be a co-ordination of regulated and permitted differences than a stereotyping of uniformity. We want a comprehending and comprehensive revision, not a compromising one. Hitherto, the history of the Prayer Book has been one long attempt to stereotype uniformity, and it has failed. There are almost as many "uses" as there are *churches*—not *dioceses*, as Cranmer complained. We have not attained that uniformity which was supposed to be desirable; and I am not sure that uniformity cannot be too dearly bought. We complain of a chimney which does not consume its own smoke; what of a National Church that cannot absorb its own dissent?

Now let us see how far the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners take us. I believe myself that they offer sufficient ground on broad and politic principles for any and every kind of revision of which the Prayer Book may be thought to be in need.

Thus they cover (1) A revision of the Kalendar, Lectionary, and Psalter.

(2) The removal of grammatical errors and obsolete English. There is a sense in which a language not understanded of the people is quite as applicable to English as to Latin.

(3) A return to the true texts of such documents as the *Te Deum*, the *Gloria in excelsis*, and others, as to which we have better knowledge than was accessible to the last revisers.

(4) Omission, addition, and re-arrangement where liturgical propriety demands such. We need, for instance, a permitted (not necessarily obligatory) re-articulation of the Communion Service, the authorization of the use of hymns, directions for, or restriction of, episcopal addresses at Confirmations, new forms for the burial of children and suicides, new offices for Missionary services. The Ely House revisers' general aim was, they tell us, not to gratify this or that party in any of

their unreasonable demands, but to do that which . . . . might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church, to encourage reverence, piety, and devotion, and to remove occasions of cavil. Let us adopt these as our aims, and see how they may be best carried out.

(1) A revision of the Kalendar, Lectionary, and Psalter.

(a) The Kalendar comes first because it fixes the course of the Church's year. I can touch only upon one or two points. First and foremost comes the question of the desirability of having a fixed, or at least a less variable, Easter. The inconvenience of the present reckoning, which is supposed to follow the date of the Jewish passover, is too obvious to need emphasizing. Nor is it as if either our style of reckoning had never been altered, or that the whole of Christendom were even to-day unanimous in the date of Easter. The Eastern Church still follows the Old Style, and if the Anglican Church decided upon a fixed date it is not impossible that other Churches might follow. The best day, as Dr. Frere suggests, would be the second Sunday in April. Easter would then always fall between the 8th and 14th of that month; Lady Day would always be clear of Holy Week, and Candlemas of Septuagesima. Some of the lesser known and obscure minor saints might well be omitted from the Kalendar, and some more peculiarly associated with the English Church or the early days of Christianity be substituted. A variable date should be suggested for Harvest Thanksgivings, and a festival for the year's blessings be provided for places which are engaged in pursuits other than agricultural.

(b) We shall all agree that many of the Old Testament lessons furnish but little edification to a mixed congregation. Why should we read on the octave of Easter the legend of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? There are some chapters, too, in the historical books from Genesis to Chronicles which do not tend to either knowledge or piety; and when we possess such rich stores of wisdom and ethical teaching in the books of Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiasticus, and Wisdom, not to speak of

selections from the greater and minor Prophets, one wishes that some of these could be substituted for those which at present hold their place. In this respect the Lectionary suggested by a Committee of Convocation in 1914 leaves little to be desired.

(c) When we come to the Psalter much the same principle of selection is needed. There are Psalms—not only the condemnatory and revengeful ones—which are not suitable for congregational or, indeed, any Christian, use. And we have our Lord's own authority for making this distinction. Revelation has always been, and still is, progressive. What was said to them of old time (while adapted to the unawakened and undeveloped conscience of those ages) has been abrogated or intensified by Christ's own teaching. The *lex talionis* has been degraded and displaced by the law of Christian love and long-suffering. It would be far better, therefore, if, instead of snipping the Psalter into sixty portions, irrespective of subject matter or applicability for use in Christian worship, a judicious selection were made and printed for each day of the week and each Sunday of the year. An excellent table of Proper Psalms for Sundays and Holy Days has been drawn up already by the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation, and another one for week-days has been supplied by Dr. Frere in his Principles of Liturgical Reform.

(2) I pass to the removal of grammatical errors and of obsolete English. Words are the coins of the mind; and just as coins vary in their value from age to age, so do words—the current medium in which ideas are expressed and exchanged—lose or gain in character, in meaning, and in connotation. Some words have absolutely reversed their meaning since the seventeenth century: for instance, "prevent" and "let." Others have appreciated: like "naughty," "worship," and "thought." Others have depreciated: like "usury," "craft," "lust," "vulgar." Some are quite obsolete: like "leasing," "alloweth," "tell," "grudge." There is nothing gained in continuing to use words which either convey no

meaning, or a wrong one, to their hearers.* There is no gain in continuing to use an unsatisfactory version of Holy Scripture. I hold no brief for the Revised Version, but it is undeniably more accurate in some places than the older version of 1611. There is no gain in being obliged to wrestle with rubrical directions which are out of date. Obedience to all and every rubric is in our altered circumstances impossible, and therefore each parish priest becomes his own reviser. Can that be right?

(3) I pass over the third point quickly, merely remarking that the texts and translations of the *Te Deum*, and of the *Gloria in excelsis*, are both sadly in need of revision. We should probably resent the changes necessary, but custom—all customs—must have a beginning; and it is possible to sacrifice too much to conservatism, and so lose in accuracy and clearness of thought and expression.

(4) I come to the last head of revision—the provision of new Offices, Prayers, and Forms of Service. In these days of re-awakened interest in Missions, we surely need some authorized forms for missionary intercession, thanksgiving, and sending forth of missionaries. These are all already in existence and in common use, but they need to be approved and legally authorised.

We want also an expansion of the Burial Service, with a restoration of the Eucharist in this and in the Marriage Service. We want some forms of Burial Service that can be used over children, over still-born infants, over suicides, and over the unbaptised. We want a form adapted for a cremation, both at the crematorium and when the ashes are deposited in a church or churchyard. We want a collect suitable for use in our mercantile marine. It has been my lot many times to conduct divine service on board ship, but the only prayer that the Prayer Book provides is that for use in H.M. Navy. More than one captain of our great passenger liners has remarked to me on this as a pressing need.

* It is satisfactory to see that the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee for the revision of the Psalter has made suggestions (June, 1916) which deal with these points.

Then I think many of us would like to see the opening address in the Marriage Service, and several of the prayers, re-written with graver attention to facts, and with the omission of rather irrelevant allusions to Old Testament history or legend. Again, without urging the adoption or compilation of hymns, would it not be well to have hymns made permissible at various points in the services, and also to restrict their use? Sometimes services are so overloaded with hymns that the true form and structure of the Office are obliterated.

But I must not dwell longer upon details. It is the principles of revision that I wish to emphasize, and to indicate some of the lines on which these principles might be applied.

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN.

The Conference of Modern Churchmen, held at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, on August 21—25, exceeded the size of its predecessors held at Ripon and Rugby, over 130 persons being present, including the Hon. and Rev. Canon R. E. Adderley, Rev. E. Bury, Mr. P. H. Bagenal, Misses E. Baird-Johnstone, Charlotte Barber, Rev. C. Bass, Mrs. Biscoe, Revs. W. H. Booth, T. B. Boss, Mrs. Eynon Bowen, Professor Caldecott, Misses M. E. Campbell, D. G. Carter, Mr. H. Clementson, Rev. D. Collyer, Miss W. Coulton, Revs. J. H. de Courcelles, E. C. Cree, W. A. Cunningham Craig, H. Dale, Misses Deards, Dickinson, Mrs. Dixon Henry Davies, Rev. W. P. F. Dorph, Misses Dougall, Earp, Mr. R. E. Edwards, Revs. W. A. Edwards, C. W. Emmet, Alfred Fawkes, Miss Ferguson, Revs. S. W. Darwin Fox, J. Gamble, Miss Alice Gardner, Professor and Mrs. Gardner, Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Garnett, Rev. C. F. Garratt, Miss Geldart, Rev. D. S. Gillmore, Rev. Canon and Mrs. Glazebrook, Mr. G. Glendenning, Rev. Hubert Handley, Miss M. H. Hart, Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Hart, Rev. S. and Mrs. Herington, Miss A. L. Hill, Mr. R. Hilton, Rev. S. E. Hooper, Mrs. Morley Horder, Revs. J. Hutchison, J. M. Jeakes, Principal and Mrs. Jevons, Revs. J. E. Kelsall, H. Laurence, Miss Leary, Mr. C. C. and Mrs. Lempriere, Rev. H. D. A. and Mrs. Major, Rev. F. Mann, Mr. C. Marsh-Roberts, Hon. Mrs. Matheson, Revs. C. H. S. Matthews, R. G. Milburn, Misses E. and M. Maude, B. Meyer, Mrs. Micklethwaite, Mrs. Millson, Revs. G. Milner, Dr. W. D. Morrison, Rev. Cavendish and Mrs. Moxon, Miss Nixon, Rev. P. V. Norwood, Miss Dora Nussey, Rev. A. P. Pannell, Miss Partridge, Revs. L. Patterson, C. Pavey, F. E. Powell, G. H. Preston, Mr.

W. Quinion, Rev. Canon and Mrs. Rashdall, Mrs. Reith, Rev. Dr. Rendall, Rev. W. C. and Mrs. Roberts, Misses Ronalds, Rev. T. F. Royds, Misses Rutherford Russell, Wills Sandford, Mrs. Demain Saunders, Revs. C. E. Seamer, Canon Selwyn, C. J. Sharp, Canon Skrine, Sir Richard and Lady Stapley, Rev. W. F. Stead, Miss Steel, Revs. Canon Stephens, W. C. Stewart, Miss D. Swayne, Rev. H. H. Symonds, Misses Thierry, Elizabeth Thompson, M. Dawes Thompson, Rev. J. M. Thompson, Mr. J. S. Thornton, Revs. Dr. Tollinton, G. E. M. Tonge, D. Bruce Walker, Miss F. E. L. Walrond, Rev. G. W. C. and Mrs. Ward, Mr. H. Vicars Webb, Revs. L. G. A. Wells, J. Frome Wilkinson, Miss Wills, Rev. Fergus Wood, Misses Mary A. Woods, Catherine A. Yates, Younghusband.

The Conference theme, "Christian Ethics," seemed to some beforehand to promise dull papers and dreary discussions. The general opinion, however, expressed by different types of people who attended the Conference, was that the papers and speeches had exhibited a large range of interest, and were both instructive and stimulating. This, of course, does not mean that perfection was attained, and that our authorities will not try to do even better next year.

In the July *Modern Churchman* (pp. 174-176) an outline was given of the course to be followed in the treatment of the theme. This was adhered to, and there is no need to repeat it here. We propose, however, to publish early in October a double number of the *Modern Churchman* (taking the place of our October and November issues), containing all the Conference papers, and, if possible, also one of the Conference sermons.

We cannot pretend that the reading of these will do more than give to those who did not attend the Conference a very limited idea of its range and interest. The Chairmen of the different sessions, Canon Rashdall particularly, were conspicuous for the assistance they gave to those who were not professed students of ethics in helping them to understand the point of view of the readers of the papers, and in seeking to supply them with thoughtful reflections by which to weigh the opinions advanced. The speeches of the Revs. W. A. Cunningham Craig, Cyril Emmet, Dr. Rendall, Miss Alice Gardner, C. J. Sharp, W. C. Roberts, H. H. Symonds, Dr. Morrison, J. Gamble, the President, and others, formed suggestive contributions to the themes under consideration. Mr. Gamble's speech, delivered after Professor Caldecott's paper, was so much of a distinct contribution to an important aspect of the subject, that we hope to include it as a separate paper in the Conference number. We regret that limited space prevents our publishing *verbatim* reports of the other speeches. Experience of the fact that summaries of speeches do not for the most part please the speakers, and generally give a poor impression of what they said, has made us decide to dispense with them altogether. The winged words, therefore, of our orators will find their honourable resting place in the memories of their hearers, and in the pocket

books (and they were not a few) of those who took notes, but they will not be embalmed in our pages.

Where impressions are so many, and, in some cases, conflicting, to analyse and relate them is not easy. The outstanding impression, we venture to think, was this: What a thoroughly safe and solid body of people the members of the Conference were. There were, no doubt, two reasons for this. First, Liberal Churchmen, however much they may differ from traditional Churchmen as to the value of certain ancient dogmatic definitions and historic affirmations, are united in the value which they place upon the Christian ethic as the supreme guide and inspiration of human conduct.

Secondly, certain burning questions closely connected with ethics, *e.g.*, the alteration of our marriage and divorce laws, the rights of women, the validity of conscientious objection and passive resistance, the nature and obligations of private property, the claims of syndicalism, the permissibility of reprisals, the need for the unflinching punishment of criminal nations as of criminal persons, did not come before the Conference prominently, or at least in such a form as to arouse controversy. It is true that the views expressed in Mr. J. M. Thompson's paper would have promoted a fiery debate had it not occurred too late in the evening to permit the many who disagreed with him acutely to express themselves.

The second impression we received was one of prevailing good temper and of patient tolerance. Speakers were polite and conciliatory, and although there were naturally marked divergences of view, for both Liberal Catholics and Liberal Protestants were present, views were expressed without acute and painful emphasis, and concessions were made when it was possible to make them.

Another impression we received was that of the religious tone of the Conference. This did not exhibit itself in pious phraseology, but in a clear recognition of the value and duty of united religious worship. The morning Eucharists in Lady Margaret Chapel and the evening services in Wadham College Chapel, were attended by large and reverent congregations.

The points of agreement between speakers at the Conference are more difficult to summarize, but we are inclined to think that there was a general agreement on the following points:—

1.—That our Lord formulated no ethical system, but enunciated certain moral principles which He enforced and illustrated by various precepts.

2.—That while the principles which our Lord enunciated are final and universal, the precepts in which, for practical purposes, they are expressed, require to be constantly re-adapted to changing circumstances and extended to new conditions. It is this which constitutes Christian ethical development.

3.—That the fundamental principle of our Lord's ethical teaching is love, *i.e.*, "a state of the desires, emotions, and will, directed towards the good of one's fellows." It is this spirit of love which constitutes the spirit

of Christianity as it does the essential nature of God, and by this spirit all conduct must be judged; in other words, not right or wrong, but loving or unloving is the standard by which the Christian must judge conduct.

4.—That the fruitless effort to insist on a literal obedience to the N.T. precepts and an unwillingness to admit that in the light of reason and experience those precepts must in certain cases be replaced by new ones, has been most prejudicial to the extension of the Christian ideal of conduct and to the reality and force of Christian teaching. Christ did not destroy O.T. literalism to set up N.T. literalism in its place. He gave men an ideal and a spirit, and they have to make working rules for themselves.

5.—That the individualistic or water-tight compartment conception of the Christian life and its other-worldliness are not in harmony with what the Spirit of Christ is saying to the English Church to-day: Rather the message runs—"You are free citizens of a Christian Empire, and you must act as Christians, not merely in worship and in your domestic relations, but in every department of your life, be it educational, social, industrial, civic, political." The kingdoms of this world are to be won for Christ, and every department of human life should be permeated by His Spirit and exemplify the operation of His principles. Vast is the task which lies ahead. It begins with the permeation of the individual by the Spirit of Christ, but it goes on to express itself in corporate effort, which reflects and propagates that transforming spirit until every side of human life is redeemed.

At the conclusion of the Conference, votes of thanks were passed to the Warden of Wadham, and to the authorities of Lady Margaret Hall, and to all those who, by their many-sided services, had helped to make the gathering a success. Votes of thanks are inadequate, as are all conventional modes of expressing gratitude; our workers, we are sure, will feel that their real reward is to be found in the result of their labour.

Perhaps we may best close this brief notice by quoting the concluding sentences of an admirable description of the Conference which appeared in the *Spectator* of September 2nd:—

> "Few can have been present who did not feel both enthusiasm and thought stimulated. In the afternoon services, held in Wadham Chapel, a liturgy was sometimes used, compiled by Mr. Handley, which translated the petitions of the Litany, beautiful in themselves, into prayers more actual, having closer relations to the feelings and temptations of the twentieth century. It was a bold attempt; but to some at least among those present it seemed to give fresh meaning and force to the Prayer Book. This meeting at Oxford was the third of the annual Conferences of the Churchmen's Union. Each shows more clearly than the last that there are many, both among the clergy and the laity, who are longing to break through the crust of a too rigid convention, and to bring the services and the teaching of the Church nearer to modern thought and aspirations."

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

West London Branch.—A meeting of this Branch was held at 33, Bloomsbury Square, by the kind invitation of Sir Richard and Lady Stapley, on Tuesday, July 25th. Thirty members were present. A thoughtful paper was read by Mr. Llewellyn Preece on "The Conflict of Natures in Human Personality." The reader argued from the point of view of biological evolution against the traditional theory of evil as the work of a personal agency external to the divine scheme of creation.

Starting from the two functions discernible in the life of plants, insects, birds, and animals, viz., self-preservation and self-reproduction, there is added to these in the developing life of *man* the gifts of reasoning power, self-consciousness, intelligence, and love,—faculties in virtue of which he becomes a spiritual being.

In addition to his instinctive faculties on the material plane (self-preservation and self-reproduction), his actions are now to be controlled by three conscious spiritual principles,—obedience to the will of God, love to his fellow-man, and the struggle for upward development.

Thus man is affected by the two diametrically opposed motives of self-love and self-sacrifice; and the secret of the large proportion of human ills is the vacillation of the will of the individual between the pursuit of these two ideals.

"What we call evil is a necessary consequence, an essential item in God's own plan of evolution, and not an intrusion into this otherwise good world created by the Almighty; not an interloping force due to some malignant Power acting against God's will."

Man's task is, then, realising that "one Life-Power works through *all*," to co-operate with the Divine Will in furthering, by dint of constant struggle, the development within himself of those spiritual faculties which raise his conduct above that of the lower animal creation.

An interesting discussion followed.

A CHANGE OF NAME.

An informal but largely attended meeting of the members of the Churchmen's Union was held at Lady Margaret Hall during one of the afternoons of the Oxford Conference, when various matters in connection with the welfare of the Union were discussed and several resolutions carried, amongst others one which urged the new Council to consider the advisability of changing the colourless and ambiguous title of our Society from Churchmen's Union to Modern Churchmen's Union.

REVIEW.

AN APPEAL TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?*

Modern Churchmen will give a very hearty welcome to this book. It is a remarkably frank appeal to the Church to face the needs of the day in theology, practice, and social questions, as the only method by which it can hope to rise to the height of its unique opportunity. In the words of the Editor "A National Mission is doomed to failure, if it means a Mission of a traditionalist Church to a Nation which is really too faithful to pretend that it can accept any longer the Creeds traditionally interpreted. There is a grave danger lest the Church, fearing to face the ultimate issues, may go forth to the world beating the drum with zeal and enthusiasm; inviting people to repentance and hope, with, all the time, its skeletons insecurely locked up in cupboards rendered ruinous by the lapse of time" (p. 155).

The writers are agreed in finding the real tragedy of the situation in the fact that it is not merely "sinners" or the indifferent, who are alienated from the Church, but men of good will, who are working for the Kingdom of God, and find the Church insufficiently Christian to attract them. They are no less agreed in their faith in the possibilities of that Church to which they belong.

A brief indication may be given of the contents of the book. Mr. Hankey, in fifty pages, discusses "The Church and the Man," *i.e.*, the average man, his beliefs, his difficulties, what he looks for in the Church, and what it actually offers him. He gives an account of an extremely interesting practical experiment in fellowship, but one feels that he is a little too severe on "campaigns" for reform and on "controversy." There are a good many people who will consider this book as quite distinctly "controversial." William Scott Palmer has two chapters, written from a very definitely "Modernist" standpoint, on "the Church and our advance in Knowledge," claiming not merely the reluctant acceptance of scientific results, but the frank admission of the scientific spirit. I would refer specially to the eloquent passage on p. 68. "The authority of science and of its hypotheses is that of a collected and organised experience. It changes where that changes; it is itself submissive to truth, and therefore it comes before men with the power of truth. . . . . It has no need of either walls or defenders; no wise man is consciously and avowedly its enemy any more than he is consciously and avowedly the enemy of himself."

---

* *Faith or Fear? An Appeal to the Church of England.* By Donald Hankey (a Student in Arms), W. S. Palmer, H. Anson, F. L. Donaldson, and C. H. S. Matthews (Editor). Macmillan & Co. 1916. 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Anson in turn has two chapters. The first is the only detailed theological discussion in the book, and is a well-argued plea for the acceptance of the real humanity of Christ, a return to the true orthodoxy of the Church, as contrasted with the popular and unconvincing way in which the Incarnation is usually presented. The second chapter deals very fairly with the stumbling blocks of the Church's attitude to social reform and its financial and patronage system. He admits that this latter works on the whole better than could be expected, and one is left with a feeling that we have to choose between a system which is a cause of offence, and yet works out reasonably well, and one which is good on paper but may break down in practice. With his colonial experience Mr. Anson might well have given us some indication of the actual results of reformed systems of patronage in New Zealand and elsewhere.

Mr. Donaldson in his single chapter on "The Church and Labour," deals with his subject sincerely, but on somewhat familiar lines. It does not appear that he shares the modernism of his fellow contributors on other questions; he finds a main remedy in the restoration of the Eucharist to the central place as the popular service, a point on which one is glad to see that the editor has later on a much needed caution.

The last hundred pages are filled by the Editor himself, who deals in a most pungent and breezy way with a variety of subjects under the general heading, "The Test of Living Experience." The title fairly sums up a main idea both of these chapters and of the book as a whole. There is a good deal of personal reminiscence both in Mr. Matthews' pages and in Mr. Hankey's. Its presence is fully justified since it shows how the writers themselves have, after considerable spiritual vicissitudes, found in Modernism a Gospel by which they themselves may live and also one which they can pass on to others. The Editor tells us of himself that "he is a Modernist because he finds in his parish, in his pastoral dealing with souls, that traditionalism is quite powerless to help those who most need help." He meets Dr. Figgis and others boldly on their own ground, and claims that he has a message for the "charcoal-burner," proving his point by a series of delightful anecdotes. He is not terrified by the bogey of upsetting the faith of the poor man; "the real fault of the theologians . . . . is that they do not trust the poor man enough, and it is just this which differentiates them from their Master." His treatment of the attempts to foreclose the results of critical discussions by appeals to authority, and of the whole question of tests is excellent, and on this point I must refer back to Mr. Hankey's witty dialogue on the difficulties of the Baptismal Service (p. 24).

I must, however, resist the temptation to quote further. The book is just what we want to place in the hands of any layman or parson who is "alive," but does not care for too technical a treatise. We have had many statements and vindications of Modernism from the academic point of view, and the writers of such a book as this would freely acknowledge their unbounded debt to those who have worked out the problems in the study. But it is time to bring them down into the market-place, and this is the modernism of practical men, with wide and varied experiences, stated so that the practical man may feel its appeal.

C. W Emmet.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CATHOLIC MODERNIST AND LIBERAL PROTESTANT.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

To Liberalize in religion is to begin to see religion and its content in their true perspective; or, at least, to be dissatisfied with the untrue. When those who liberalize in this way are Catholics, the process takes the shape of Liberal Catholicism, or, as it is loosely called, Modernism; when they are Protestants it becomes Liberal Protestantism, a Protestantism of a broad and progressive type. Among ourselves, most Liberal Churchmen come from the Protestant section of the Church, which is numerically the larger, and by temperament and training the more rational. But the Liberalizing movement among Anglicans who would describe themselves as Catholics is a hopeful feature in English religion; and it is natural that they should feel themselves drawn to Liberalism rather of the Catholic than of the Protestant type. On the side of observance, indeed, this position has much to recommend it; the danger of Protestantism—it is not, of course, always incurred—is to underate the symbolical and historical elements in religion, and to leave feeling out of account.

But, when we consider the differentiae between the two schools, the history of the recent Modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church is instructive. Of the methods by which this movement was suppressed, there can be no two opinions; in the words of a witness so friendly to Rome and so hostile to Modernism as the *Church Times*, "they were base, and crudely base." And the Pope's victory was Pyrrhic. It was a victory because, in so far as Modernism aimed at a reform of Catholicism, it is finished and the men are scattered; the movement is at an end. It was a Pyrrhic victory because its effort has been to accelerate the working of the inevitable forces which are making for the dissolution of Catholicism, Roman and non-Roman. These forces work, more or less, rapidly; the success of Modernism would have diminished, that of Clericalism has increased, the rate at which they advance. Οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ: the Pope, who should know his own business best, does not care. But there is another side to the matter: Rome was as right in logic as it was wrong in morals and in religion; and, looking back upon the conflict, it is difficult to see how—unless the time had come (which it had not) for the final disappearance of Papalism—it could have ended otherwise than it did. For Catholicism is, and is by the law of its being, all that Liberalism, or Modernism, is a revolt against; the theocratic hierarchy, tradition, and the whole pre-scientific outlook over life which they stand for. In the Church of Rome this conception of religion has been brought to formal completeness by the Vatican Definition of 1870; and, still more, by the historical policy of the Popes. But the contradiction between Liberalism and non-Roman Catholicism is as fundamental. Catholics of this non-Roman type "are ready," we have been told, "to give up a literal belief in the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, provided criticism requires them to do so, but they will, at the same time, maintain the full practice of

the Mass and the Confessional." This is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance. For the critical argument against the Mass and the Confessional is very much more conclusive than that against the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb; to allow it in the latter, and to disallow it in the former case, is to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel—driver and pack included. How can "the full practice of the Mass and the Confessional" survive the belief in a wonder-working priesthood? And how can this belief, though it may linger in the backwaters of religious sentiment, face the more rigorous thought and the more exact knowledge of the modern world? Protestantism, too, has its outworn and parasitic growths. Yes; but it is the stronger for their pruning and excision; while Catholicism stands or falls with them—with its official standards, with dogma, with the hierarchy, with the priest. Hobbes described the Papacy as "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire;" Liberal Catholicism may be described as "the ghost of the deceased Roman Church." Not till the realities have worn thin and threadbare do such ghosts make their appearance. And their tenure of existence is slight and passing; with cock-crow they disappear.

It is impossible not to think that certain features of Catholicism which, from long habit, retain a hold even on the Liberal Catholic—the Power of the Keys; the sacrifices of Masses; Transubstantiation, and its corollary Eucharistic Adoration—are analogous to such beliefs as that in Verbal Inspiration, in the Allegorical sense of Scripture, or in the Substitution theory of the Atonement, with which the Protestant, from association, parts reluctantly; but which, given the changed religious perspective, must retain their values in new combinations and under new forms. We still sing Cowper's fine hymn, "There is a fountain filled with blood," and Charles Wesley's "Lo! He comes with clouds descending;" and some of us, of whom I confess myself one, would be sorry not to do so. But we do so by a certain *tour de force*. The words do not now come instinctively to us; we have ceased to think in this way. I do not think that the next generation, which will approach them without our associations, will sing them; and I think that the Mass and the Confessional are parallel, in this respect, to these time-honoured but disappearing hymns.

We may believe, then, that any friction between the two sections of the Liberal body, the Protestant and the Catholic, will be temporary; because the beliefs and practices which give occasion to it will at no distant date disappear. Divergence of ceremonial may remain; some will like a simpler, some a more ornate, worship; differences of accent and feeling will find expression—with regard *e.g.* to the prominence given to the Lord's Supper, to prayer for the dead, to the relation of the Church militant to the Church triumphant, and in general to that continuity of sentiment, thought and usage, which our English Church wisely recognizes, and which means more to some than to others; here, within large limits, "let every man abound in his own sense." For "those rites and those doctrines which have made most noise in the Romanist controversy, are those," says Mark Pattison (*Essays* ii. 255), "which are the least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Reliques, Images, Purgatory, and Masses—these

bywords with the vulgar and the unthinking are powerless decorations or natural developments. The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority, or law, placed without it, and exercised by men assuming to act in the name of Heaven." This is the keystone. Remove it, and sooner or later—and sooner rather than later—the arch falls.

ALFRED FAWKES.

Ashby St. Ledgers.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Since you invite remarks on the interesting paper which appeared under the above heading in the July number of the *Modern Churchman*, I venture to make a few suggestions which may possibly help in the discussion.

It may be safely asserted that among those who are attracted to our Society, some are primarily, and *must* be "modern" in thought, and are content to remain Churchmen, and others *must* be Churchmen, and are glad to realise that they may at the same time be modern; but I would very strongly emphasize the statement (p. 155) that "each [name] covers a variety of types." Not only have we a combination of two elements in varying proportions, but in some specimens we seem to find both acting with great potency; and in the same individual, without any distinct mental crisis, the sacramentarian or the critical view may rise or fall to almost any degree. Further, some of the leaders of liberal thought among Churchmen do not seem to be easily reduced under either type. If one may cite a Liberal Churchman of the last generation, who nevertheless has followers still, F. D. Maurice was as "high" in sacramental views and feelings as he was "broad" in his comprehensiveness of mind. The present Dean of St. Paul's is, perhaps, our first living exponent of the significance of Church symbols, and some of us might regard him as almost too severe on "modern" Churchmen of the Loisy type, yet no one goes further than he in critical exposition of Scripture and Creed. The point that I should like to emphasize is that (critical habits apart) Catholicism appeals to the educated modern on three sides:—that of historical continuity; of authority as enforcing more or less of corporate unity; and of the consecration of symbol as the least defective exponent of religious truth. If there should ever be a serious split among "Catholic Modernists" and "Liberal Protestants," would not the rock of destruction be rather that of governmental *authority* than that of history or ritual, or even belief? Personally, I should not fear that many modern Churchmen would wish to tighten the reins of authority, yet there can be no doubt that some agreement as to the essential nature of ecclesiastical authority might be advantageous, especially at this time when the war has led us all to believe in discipline.

ALICE GARDNER.

Bristol.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The article in your July issue entitled "The Catholic Modernist and the Liberal Protestant," is of unusual importance. It is, at any rate, of special interest to myself; for I have felt the menace of the crisis indicated.

I am, and have always been, a High Church Anglican. The High Church satisfies my personal religious needs. It was my first, and I fully expect will be my last love, in the religious life, as far as this pilgrimage is concerned. To particularise, I see the value of historic continuity, of Creeds—not excepting the Athanasian Creed—and of ministerial succession, in Church life. I am not willing to make breaks with the past. I refuse to put "nots" in the Creed. I will not part with the dogmas transmitted by the early Church; though I hold that the progressive interpretation of those dogmas is the function of theology. It seems to me indubitable that the Anglican Church conserved the principal values of the Catholic heritage all through the vicissitudes of the Reformation; and consequently I claim for the Church of my Baptism a historic position to the full as venerable and august as that of the Roman Communion or any other part of Christianity. If, for example, the priests of Anglicanism should turn out not to be priests, that would be, not because of anything defective in their succession or ordination, but because it had become evident that the scheme of Christianity contained no priests at all. To call the second order of Greek and Roman clergymen priests and that of Anglicans ministers, is an illogical absurdity. Either they are all priests together, or all ministers.

But then, with all this confidence in Anglican Catholicity, I do not claim a monopoly of grace for High Church Anglicanism, and I can accordingly respect and sympathise with people whose religious affections are placed elsewhere in the wide circle of Christianity. I can well imagine that Romanism, Evangelicalism, Presbyterianism, the Holy Orthodox system, the Eastern Churches, Wesleyanism, and many another form of Christianity, have for others something of the same charm, the same spiritual and almost romantic associations as High Anglicanism has for me; nor does my loyalty to Anglicanism require me to set down the feelings of those others as illusion, to contend—as Rome (officially) contends in regard to others—that they have no grace, no part or lot in the things of God.

We spoke of crisis; but it is not perhaps my own feelings and convictions that would force a crisis. The danger of that comes from one's surroundings. With some people, whether for psychological reasons or from theological education I know not, it seems impossible for personal religion to become intense without causing hostility to the personal religion of others. They cannot be loyal to their own love—if one may use this metaphor—without depreciating the loves of their fellow Christians. They have got hold of Christianity in one way, and that a good way; and they seem unable to allow that there may be also other ways of getting hold of it; ways if not as good as their own, yet as good as other people's circumstances may for the time being admit of.

And this state of mind makes them clamour for premature and artificial decisions in the debateable matters of theology. It is just this type of decisions that the Catholic Modernist—the High Anglican of my own type—cannot give.

What I would say on this point has been already so well put by Dr. Alfred Plummer that it is sufficient to refer to his article, "Christian Agnosticism," in *The Expository Times* for February, 1916. He argues that

as, in connection with certain theological problems, *e.g.*, the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the modus of the Incarnation, the Kenosis, the nature of sacramental grace, the conditions of sacramental validity, certainty is unattainable, it is our duty, not indeed to abstain from forming an opinion and having a belief, but to abstain from condemning other Christians for not thinking as we do about the theological points in question. "Religious truth is a very large thing, and none of us grasps more than a fragment of it."

For the past two years I have been in a position to practise to some extent the foregoing principles. I have described the situation in a chapter added to Mr. J. H. Fry's book *Boulogne and Berlin.* The church of which I am in charge has recently benefitted by the services of a great many clergy. Both in idea and in fact, the Church services centre round the Holy Communion. My practice then has been not to adhere rigidly myself, nor to ask others to adhere, to any one particular manner or system of celebrating the Holy Communion. At some Celebrations I wear Eucharistic vestments, at others not. When I invite a visiting priest to celebrate, I tell him that he is master of the sanctuary for the time being. This does not imply that I approve equally of all the uses employed, or that I should be averse to seeing Anglican practice gravitating towards a uniform use. But my theory and my practice constitute a deliberate attempt to face the actual facts of the situation presented by Anglicanism.

But just here is where one's practical difficulties come in. Suspension of judgment in theology and compromise in ecclesiastical politics look weak. People hailing from all quarters of the religious compass—for Anglicanism is so comprehensive that it looks towards almost every part of the horizon of religious psychology—are sure to call one weak because one allows other opinions, other interpretations, that is, besides one's own, to find expression in the system one is endeavouring to work. They cannot imagine how systematic concession to various sundered interests, the constant endeavour to attract antagonistic things, can possibly be a deliberate policy, not a mere exhibition of timid temporizing.

Well, it may be that the real firmness is to stand by one's theological liberalism even when people are interpreting it as weakness, that the truest courage is not to fear being thought afraid. When some have urged me to turn the cold shoulder to So and So, because he Romanizes, I have refused to do so. After all, the Church of Rome is Christian; and the Romanizers of Anglicanism are, it must be admitted, a troublesome section, yet they constitute a sort of living link, whose existence we need not regret, between the Anglican and the Roman Christianities. When other extremists have urged me to force Catholic interpretations on persons of Protestant upbringing and sympathies, I have replied that patience, not intellectual violence, is the true method of Christian instruction. A certain masterful Church dignitary urged me to make all the clergy do as I liked. I quietly, but definitely enough, rejected the suggestion.

No; if Anglicanism is composite; if the content of Christian doctrine is manifold; if theological verities have aspects which the human reason cannot adequately or exhaustively present to itself, the sooner those facts are generally recognized in Church life and politics the better.

It will be in place to glance at the general attitude of the modern Anglican Episcopate towards religious development. The Anglican Episcopate has often been blamed for its tendency to compromise. *Episcopi Anglicani semper pavidi*—the saying has become almost proverbial.

One has often felt inclined to echo these sentiments of detraction; but speaking for myself, as the years have passed, and I have been able to give the matter fuller attention, two considerations respecting the post-Reformation Episcopate have been increasingly present to my mind. One is, how imperfectly we are accustomed to estimate an Anglican bishop's practical difficulties. What it must be to be called on every day of one's life to balance conservative and progressive values; to struggle with the problem of reconciling opposing interests; to be asked to soothe feelings ruffled in all sorts of different directions; to have to stretch a point here and another there; to endure tortures of uncertainty as to whether the effect of decisions made, or about to be made, will turn out well or badly, will check dangerous tendencies or hinder rich developments in Church life; to realise that the directive ideas, the penetrating criticisms, the partial solutions, the nebulous suggestions of Biblical exegetes, of dogmatic and moral theologians, of liturgiologists, and a dozen more classes of intellectual workers, have all got somehow to be translated into terms of practice, and turned to account in a society largely composed of dull and refractory elements,—I say again, what must it be!

And the second consideration is an interrogative one. Has not this seeming weakness of the Anglican Episcopate, this tendency to compromise, this predilection for loose solutions, this working principle which seems to spell "Trust in Providence and muddle through," been after all the safeguard of the Church's life? Surely in the long run, in the progress of theology, in the further issues of evolution, the genius of Anglicanism will prove to have been more far sighted than that, *e.g.* of Romanism. When on some theological problem or liturgical point or historical question, all has been said that can be said with the available data, is not the method of Anglicanism with its frank "We don't know," or "We cannot answer more definitely than thus," or "This is the best course for the time being," really both a wiser and a more courageous method than that of Romanism, which whatever question may be put to it never dares to answer "We don't know." The promise of the future is not with the Church that claims to see, illumined, its furthest vistas; but with the Church that, like Abraham, steps out not knowing whither.

The moral motive force of Christian reunion was rightly distinguished a few years back, in the *Modern Churchman*. Since the Kingdom of God is Love, the determining force which establishes it is likewise love. And when it is remembered that historically as well as Scriptually and theologically, light and love go together, nay, rather are fundamentally identical, it will become apparent that the feeling for reunion can co operate effectively with intellectual effort, only when that effort is genuine, when it faces facts, when it is painstaking, truthseeking, and free.

Wise and humane compromises, working agreements, are the natural first-fruits of a psychological process in which such factors operate; and in

the whole extent of modern Christendom, what group of Christians is by inherited temperament and religious genius so fitted to develop this method, as the Anglican Episcopate? What group of leaders occupies so good a vantage ground? Anglicanism is now world-wide; it is in touch with almost every other form of Christianity. Is it not therefore pertinent to hope that the Anglican Episcopate will employ this fruitful principle of compromise to fuller effect in the near future?

Let us glance at two or three possible applications. So far as the Eucharistic controversy is concerned, why should not the example of the Scottish Episcopal Church be followed, a Church with which we are in full communion? Its Prayer Book gives the choice of two Liturgies. Why should not ours do likewise? The individual priest could use his discretion as to which he would use, and when. For my part in such case I should use the one at certain Celebrations, the other at others; and vary the ritual accordingly.

Or again, take the Orders question. When will it ever be really settled precisely what is meant by the Apostolic Succession,—whether it derives from the Apostolate in the wider, or in the narrower sense; which bodies of Christians belong to it, and which do not; what it implies. and what it does not imply in respect of sacramental validity and the corporate possession of grace? Now that generation after generation of divines have given the fullest and most learned consideration to these questions, is there any sort of reason in continuing to expect final and definite answers to them? Has not rather the time arrived when a working agreement might be proposed by, say, the Anglican Bishops to the old Catholic Bishops or the Greek Orthodox Bishops, an agreement to the effect that human inquiry having done all it could do in elucidating the nature of the Christian Ministry, and determining the validity of the ministerial successions possessed by those ecclesiastical systems, the Communions, two or more which were parties to the agreement, should make, in Latin, a devotional act before God, undertaking to desist thenceforward from controversy about the status of their respective ministries; and each to recognise, by faith in God's power and will to make up imperfections, if such exist, the ministry of the other as not less valid than its own? Such an act would be one of rational charity, and surely not of presumptuous faith. It would do away with offensive measures such as re-ordination, as between the consenting communions; and it would invite consideration of a fuller reunion between them.

Put otherwise, this suggestion means that the principle of Conditionalism should be more largely employed than is done at present, in the cause of Christian reunion. To begin by establishing such working agreements between episcopally organised forms of Christianity would seem the most natural step; but undoubtedly the same principle of accommodation by faith could be exploited in other connexions and directions. It is a sound theological principle. It has been recognised and applied before now, in the history of Christianity. What we have to desiderate is its thoroughgoing application and full extension in the spirit of illumined love. Such a development must inevitably advance the Kingdom of God.

Church of St. John E., Boulogne, France. H. NORTHCOTE.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

On the occasion of a certain high ecclesiastical appointment in recent times, a Church paper of "definite views," expressed its disappointment that one who had appeared to be a "Catholic Modernist" was now revealed as a "Liberal Protestant." "Which things are an allegory." There is in fact no such clear line of cleavage (happily) as the writer of the article would have us believe.

Anglican Liberals are neither "Catholics" nor "Protestants" in the same sense as those terms might be applied to a French Romanist or a German Lutheran.

Our own communion strives to follow the *Via Media* in the steps of Hooker, Butler, Lightfoot, and "the goodly fellowship of the Prophets" since the sixteenth century.

On the one hand, we retain those elements of historic order and continuity which appeal to the mind of such a thinker as Mr. R. J. Campbell, and which find their best expression in the writings of the present Dean of Wells. On the other hand we find room for "liberty of prophesying."

Thus *both* "Catholic Modernist" and "Liberal Protestant" might stand as truly descriptive of the Anglican ideal. In so far as any real "crisis" is to be feared, as the article seems to suggest, we should probably find our best solution along the lines laid down by Professor Kirsopp Lake in his most recent book, *i.e.*, an avoiding of all schemes for "corporate reunion," side by side with a full and frank recognition of the varieties of religious experience and the reality of sacramental grace in forms alien from our own ideas. But there is surely no need to draw so direct an antithesis. We are not required to abandon the traditionally "Anglican" position for Catholic aestheticism or Protestant anarchy!

The Hostel, Bishop's Court, Isle-of-Man,
July 17th, 1916.

C. R. NORCOCK.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

It may be worth while to enquire if the above dichotomy is quite just,—whether the three terms, Liberal, Protestant, and Modernist, do not represent in regard to thought one and the same position. For Protestantism has run to Liberalism as its leader of thought, and Modernism on the side of thought is just Liberalism. Against all three stands Catholicism. To Roman Catholics nothing is so hateful as Modernism. The Pope will soon cut it up. Tyrrell is dead; Loisy, industrious but not original, represents only German criticism. Anglo-catholic Modernists *apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto.* But how can there ever be many Catholic Modernists, whom the writer of the paper so aptly describes as "calling in ecclesiastical authority to guarantee that which criticism has threatened to destroy?" Criticism is but a form of knowledge—tentative, comparative, inductive, advancing. What can authority avail against it? Probably organisation—the Catholic organisation—will long outlast authority. But the position of a Catholic Modernist is far too refined and dangerous to be popular.

Still must we assume that the lines of Catholic and Protestant are permanent and unbreachable by future discoveries in theology? Is there not a larger synthesis? Must we exclude the possible influence of the Eastern Church on modern controversy? Is it not within the bounds of possibility that the eyes of Churchmen may yet be opened to the fact that not a single person in the West is orthodox, because we all hold the *Filioque*, and the *Filioque* is false. In England we never were without it, for it was interpolated in the decade before Augustine landed. Perhaps it cannot go without "disintegration." The Pope in 800 publicly proclaimed the interpolation. But no Pope will ever admit it again.

The solution of the question depends upon two lines of reasoning, one in the N.T., and one in LXX. The great Cambridge triumvirate never studied the usage of the term "spirit" in N.T. Lightfoot's treatment of it is most disappointing. Westcott only increased the difficulties of it. Hort never dealt with it. None of them had taken the right point of view for its investigation; it requires a study of LXX., which nobody has yet made.

Knowledge limits faith, as Westcott said, and it is a powerful solvent of much that passes for faith, but is merely a blind following of tradition. Knowledge, then, may be expected to mitigate theological acrimony, but what can dissolve the financial bonds that solidify theological differences? Theology is not so devoid of unexplored territory as many suppose, and in exploring further it may yet discover a garden of Eden, or perchance it may be forced to think

"As in strange lands a traveller walking slow
In doubt and perplexity
A little before moonrise . . . . 'I have found
A new land, but I die.'"

E. C. SELWYN.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

This is a most interesting subject, and one I have thought about a good deal. Therefore, though a simple layman, I should like to say a few words thereon.

When dealing with a matter of this importance, it is well to get down to the foundation and build on that, instead of on detail and superstructure.

It seems to me that the fundamental reasons why these two parties are at present in alliance, but may easily become antagonistic, are due to the diversified stress laid by them on the ruling principles of their general behaviour.

The perfect Christian behaviour, as exemplified by Our Lord, is controlled by three fundamental principles:—

1. Love of God and all His work.
2. Faith in God.
3. Desire for Truth.

The difference between the various types of present-day Christians is due to the uses made of these three principles.

It is fairly obvious that the Liberals and Modernists agree in resting their main stress on the third principle and are so far in harmony together, and in opposition to the orthodox, who largely disregard this principle. On the other hand, all Catholics, orthodox and un-orthodox, have, to some extent, replaced the other two principles by "Love of the Church" and "Faith in the Church." The orthodox Protestant builds entirely on the first two true principles, though some are inclined to combine the second with "Faith in the Bible."

It is, I think, obvious that only those who hold principles in common can be truly in alliance. It is also certain that those who build on the true principles must prevail over those who prefer subsidiary ones.

It would, therefore, seem utterly wrong for the Liberal Protestants to modify their principles in any way in order to harmonise with Modernists, and for the purpose of strengthening their material position. But there is room, I suggest, for them to strengthen their hold on the first two principles and thus become more in harmony with the orthodox Protestants. They are inclined to overlook this in their desire for truth. Their cause can then be safely left to the Master.

8, *Queen Anne's Gate*, LLEWELLYN PREECE.
Westminster, S.W., July 24th, 1916.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

You ask for discussion of this thoughtful and temperate article. I do not want to call myself a "Catholic Modernist," but I am certainly not a Protestant in the sense that your contributor is, and as it is desirable that fellow-members of the Churchmen's Union should try to understand one another, I will venture on a few comments on the article in question.

I do not know whether there are in the Church of England any who, while "claiming full intellectual liberty in matters of belief," yet keep "intact" their "belief in a Catholic Church with *definite* authority;" I doubt it, and can make no claim to speak for them. I expect that most of us in these matters will act wisely if we speak only for ourselves.

I am one of those who have come into the Church of England from outside. Brought up in a Nonconformity neither illiberal nor uncultured, "the stern simplicity," "the bareness of its external setting," was never dear to me from my earliest years. I am, I suppose, one of those who are sometimes called "temperamental Catholics." I wanted the Mass; I wanted, less ardently—no, I needed—the Confessional. It was for these that I came into the Church of England. It was in vain that the saintly and venerable Nonconformist pastor told me that I was perfectly free to remain in his communion and believe in the Real Presence, as it was said Dr. Dale did. My experience, so far as it has any value, tells me two things.

(1) We have in the Mass a Divinely-given centre for our worship—the adjective stands whatever view you take of the historical original of the Christian Eucharist. Superstitious observances are no more inherent in the worship of the Mass than in the use of Holy Scripture. Wise or foolish,

learned or simple, we can adore the Lamb as it has been slain, in the midst of the worshipping congregation. The real question is whether an all-availing Sacrifice has been offered; whether a Divine Companion has been given us. And that is unaffected by historical criticism.

(2) "The Church of Rome presents a more congenial field than does the Church of England." No! The Church of Rome does not believe in liberty. I long to be in communion with Rome; but the thing always has been, and remains, impossible, precisely because of that authoritarianism which your contributor regards as essentially Catholic. Surely it is a political thing. Catholic worship and the Catholic ideal of life carry their intrinsic appeal; Roman politics have had more to do with alienating Europe from them than anything else.

Your contributor betrays this political view of Catholicism when he speaks of Catholic Modernists desiring to "maintain the full practice of the Mass and the Confessional." He regards them as instruments in the hands of "sacerdotalists" for keeping a hold over men's minds and consciences. Rubbish! They have been used so, of course; and the ecclesiastical politicians of Rome have had their rivals, as your contributor remembers, in Geneva and elsewhere.

As for having "no wish to alter the ancient discipline and order of the Church," surely no thoughtful Churchman wants to withstand the process of development; witness, as one example out of many, Dr. Dearmer's recent article in the *Guardian* on the ministry of women. As for bolting the door against re-union with Nonconformists, is not Mr. Rawlinson's article in *Foundations* significant of a very marked change amongst English Catholics?

There is a place (and does not Anglicanism stand for it?) for an authority in the Church, which is patronal not peremptory, negative rather than positive, and that endeavours to carry with it the common judgment of the Church as a body. Sacerdotalism is an unnecessarily ugly word for those who hold that a Christian minister should not take this office on himself, but should await for the call and authority of his Church.

Who is there, anywhere, who wants to maintain the *status quo* in questions of order and discipline, or of theological definition? Who does not sympathize with the *dictum*, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and regret that it does not exist?" But the Mass (call it by what name you will) is as central as the Paternoster; what other focus for our worship can there be, if our worship is centred in Christ? The method of its celebration may be reformed, developed, beautified; but never set on one side, never (as some strangely plead) made secondary to the daily offices. The highest use of Morning Prayer is as a preparation for Communion; the highest use of Evening Prayer is as a thanksgiving for it.

Finally, what is the significance of Dr. Orchard and his friends?

A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL.

---

* The Editor regrets being compelled to hold over a large amount of correspondence.